

# EXHIBIT I

**Ercolini, Michael**

---

**From:** Seeve, Brian  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 09, 2021 8:27 PM  
**To:** Matthias Kamber  
**Cc:** abruns@keker.com; Carrie J. Parker; Gayle-Luz, Keisha; Gannon, Kevin; Asim Bhansali; Singular; nathan.speed@wolfgreenfield.com  
**Subject:** Re: Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC - C.A. No. 1:19-cv-12551-FDS - Logistical issues for David Patterson Depo 3/10  
**Attachments:** AgileLaw-Security.pdf

Dear Matthias,

You have yet to explain exactly what your concerns with Agile are, and it is becoming increasingly clear that this is because they are in fact merely a delaying tactic that you have manufactured out of whole cloth.

Agile is a standard, widely used deposition-services platform with robust security features, as you would have discovered if you had any genuine desire to look into the issue. These security features are explained in the whitepaper that I have attached to this email, and that we have previously provided to Google in preparation for this deposition. This whitepaper is also a public document that is accessible via the "Google" search engine (which can be accessed using the web address <http://www.google.com>). Your attempts to paint Agile as anything less than a trustworthy, reliable, industry-standard deposition services platform are based on innuendo and prevarication, and nothing more.

As I stated previously, we will proceed with Dr. Patterson's deposition tomorrow, using the Agile software as planned. Please inform us as soon as possible whether Google intends to honor its earlier promise to produce Dr. Patterson for his scheduled deposition.

Best,

- Brian

On Mar 9, 2021, at 7:22 PM, Matthias Kamber <[mkamber@keker.com](mailto:mkamber@keker.com)> wrote:

Brian,

We have done everything we can to allow this deposition to proceed tomorrow as planned, including making last-minute arrangements, at our cost, to ensure proper security. Those concerns are neither untimely or unfounded; we raised them last week, well in advance of the deposition, and relate to the use of services that have known security issues (as my children know from Zoom-bombers joining their virtual classrooms). As for Veritext, the claim that they "require the use of Zoom software" is simply not true; I am not sure where you may have gotten that impression, but certainly not from us. Veritext has been able to conduct remote depositions using the tools we have asked for here on numerous occasions—and can do so tomorrow, as well. If they told you otherwise, and that is the genesis of all of these issues, then that is unfortunate.

None of this is meant in bad faith. Nor is any of it meant to stop you from taking Dr. Patterson's deposition. We are prepared to proceed using Veritext (or Esquire using WebEx), but Google is not willing to have the witness use the Agile Law platform, which was first disclosed to us on Friday. Alternatively, the deposition can proceed via Esquire/WebEx but using Drive for exhibits using the links we provide you. Given all this, we fail to see any basis for seeking sanctions if Singular insists on using Agile Law instead.

As for the allegation that we "admitted" to withholding documents until the eve of the deposition, that is not well taken. We have not withheld any of his documents from production prior to the deposition; we have, however, warned you of the possibility of other documents related to Dr. Patterson may be part of our next production. To take the courtesy of that fair warning and misconstrue it as you do is all the more unhelpful because it is so orthogonal to the issue of deposition mechanics that we are grappling with.

Again, to the extent you need to reach me, I am available at 415.244.5921. Ideally this will be resolved by tonight so that the deposition can proceed smoothly tomorrow morning.

Regards,

Matthias

---

**From:** Seeve, Brian <[bseeve@princetonobel.com](mailto:bseeve@princetonobel.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 9, 2021 3:48 PM

**To:** Matthias Kamber <[MKamber@keker.com](mailto:MKamber@keker.com)>

**Cc:** Andrew S. Bruns <[ABruns@keker.com](mailto:ABruns@keker.com)>; Carrie J. Parker <[CParker@keker.com](mailto:CParker@keker.com)>; [kgayleluz@princetonobel.com](mailto:kgayleluz@princetonobel.com); [kgannon@princetonobel.com](mailto:kgannon@princetonobel.com); [abhansali@kblfirm.com](mailto:abhansali@kblfirm.com); [singular@princetonobel.com](mailto:singular@princetonobel.com)

**Subject:** Re: Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC - C.A. No. 1:19-cv-12551-FDS - Logistical issues for David Patterson Depo 3/10

[EXTERNAL]

---

Dear Matthias,

Your objections to our chosen deposition services platform are unfounded and untimely. They appear to be based entirely on the fact that one of the links on the AgileLaw homepage—which is wholly separate from AgileLaw's deposition services software and not directly related in any way to its security features—appears to be broken. You bring these objections to us on the eve of a deposition that was noticed and planned well over a week ago.

You also claim that "we never said Veritext was not an option," but this is false. As you know, Veritext requires the use of Zoom software, and you can plainly see in the email chain below that your own paralegal Carrie Parker told us that "the Patterson deposition cannot go forward using Zoom." This prohibition is apparently one of many artificial restrictions that Google places on its employees in the context of depositions, the sole purpose of which appears to be obstructing litigation and preventing opposing counsel from conducting proper discovery.

These bad faith tactics are not the only ones you have used to stop us from taking Dr. Patterson's deposition. Less than a week ago you admitted that you had withheld documents from production until the eve of the deposition and further admitted that they were likely relevant to questions we might want to ask Dr. Patterson.

We will proceed with the deposition as planned, using the Agile deposition services software. If Google fails to produce Dr. Patterson tomorrow for his deposition, Singular will move for appropriate sanctions. We are confident that the court will see any such move for what it is: a clear attempt on the part of Google to stall discovery and obstruct this litigation.

Best,

- Brian

On Mar 9, 2021, at 1:21 PM, Gannon, Kevin <[kgannon@princelobel.com](mailto:kgannon@princelobel.com)> wrote:

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Matthias Kamber <[mkamber@keker.com](mailto:mkamber@keker.com)>  
**Date:** March 9, 2021 at 1:00:41 PM EST  
**To:** "McGonagle, Dan" <[DMcGonagle@princelobel.com](mailto:DMcGonagle@princelobel.com)>  
**Cc:** [abruns@keker.com](mailto:abruns@keker.com), [cparker@keker.com](mailto:cparker@keker.com), "Gayle-Luz, Keisha" <[kgayleluz@princelobel.com](mailto:kgayleluz@princelobel.com)>, "Gannon, Kevin" <[kgannon@princelobel.com](mailto:kgannon@princelobel.com)>, [abhansali@kblfirm.com](mailto:abhansali@kblfirm.com), [stevellis@google.com](mailto:stevellis@google.com)  
**Subject:** Re: Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC - C.A. No. 1:19-cv-12551-FDS - Logistical issues for David Patterson Depo 3/10

Dan,

Following up on the below, Google continues to have concerns about the security of the AgileLaw platform. Notably, both the links to "Security" on AgileLaw's homepage seem to be broken—a not encouraging sign. Please therefore have your vendor reach out to Steve Ellis at Google, cc'd here, to answer questions about platform security.

We are also looking into a backup option for tomorrow's deposition. Google has used Veritext to conduct depositions and would be willing to pay the reporter's appearance fee for Dr. Patterson's deposition so as to ensure that secure platforms are used for both the videoconferencing and exhibit sharing. We are looking into whether Veritext would be able to supply a reporter/setup for tomorrow if necessary.

Thanks,

Matthias

On Mar 8, 2021, at 1:43 PM, McGonagle, Dan  
<[dmcgonagle@princelobel.com](mailto:dmcgonagle@princelobel.com)> wrote:

[EXTERNAL]

---

Andy,

Agile Law does not require any deponent to download third-party software in order to use it during the course of the deposition. The deponent and counsel just visits the Agile Law website, enters their name, email, and a pin number that will be provided by us. They will then be admitted into the deposition.

This tool is one that our attorneys are already familiar with. To address any security concerns that you or Google might have, our vendor has made themselves available to discuss.

Please let me know.

Thanks,  
Dan

---

**From:** Andrew S. Bruns [<mailto:abruns@keker.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 8, 2021 2:08 PM  
**To:** McGonagle, Dan <[DMcGonagle@princelobel.com](mailto:DMcGonagle@princelobel.com)>; [cparker@keker.com](mailto:cparker@keker.com); Gayle-Luz, Keisha <[kgayleluz@princelobel.com](mailto:kgayleluz@princelobel.com)>  
**Cc:** Gannon, Kevin <[kgannon@princelobel.com](mailto:kgannon@princelobel.com)>; [abhansali@kblfirm.com](mailto:abhansali@kblfirm.com); [mkamber@keker.com](mailto:mkamber@keker.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC - C.A. No. 1:19-cv-12551-FDS - Logistical issues for David Patterson Depo 3/10

Dan,

Carrie passed along the thread below. I understand that you and your team have been in touch with her regarding the logistics for Wednesday's deposition of David Patterson. I'm writing to follow-up on one remaining logistical issue, the handling of deposition exhibits.

As I believe Carrie has noted, given Singular's likely use of Google's confidential business information as part of Dr. Patterson's remote deposition (and subsequent depositions in this case), Google has security concerns regarding Singular's intent to utilize a third-party vendor to handle deposition exhibits. Moreover, Google employees only have access to their corporate-issued machines for work activities, such as depositions. These machines, have specific technical and security configurations, which do not allow or even support many third party software tools.

Given these issues, Google asks that Google Drive be used by both parties to handle any exhibits for depositions in this case. We are willing to provide assistance to your team and the court reporter, including with setting up Drive accounts and folders, a demonstration of their use, etc. We are also happy to discuss this issue on the phone this afternoon, Pacific time, or tomorrow. Please let us know what times might work for a call. Absent agreement to use Google Drive, we'll need to discuss further how to resolve any security concerns.

Best,  
Andy

---

**Andrew Bruns**

Keker, Van Nest & Peters LLP  
633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
415 962 8821 direct | 415 391 5400 main  
[abruns@keker.com](mailto:abruns@keker.com) | [vcard](#) | [keker.com](http://keker.com)  
*Pronouns: he/him/his*

---

**From:** McGonagle, Dan  
<[dmcgonagle@princelobel.com](mailto:dmcgonagle@princelobel.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 5, 2021 1:53 PM  
**To:** Carrie J. Parker  
<[CParker@keker.com](mailto:CParker@keker.com)>; [kgayleluz@princelobel.com](mailto:kgayleluz@princelobel.com)  
**Cc:** [kgannon@princelobel.com](mailto:kgannon@princelobel.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC - C.A.  
No. 1:19-cv-12551-FDS - Logistical issues for David  
Patterson Depo 3/10

**[EXTERNAL]**

---

Hi Carrie,  
Keisha forwarded along your correspondence. We will be using AgileLaw for the purposes of presenting exhibits for the upcoming deposition. Attached is a document that explains the product and details the security functions that it has.

The vendor has made himself available for discussion to explain how the product works and address any security concerns that you might have. Let us know if you want us to set that up.

Thanks,

**Dan McGonagle**

Prince Lobel Tye LLP  
One International Place, Suite 3700  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110  
  
617.456.8081 Direct  
[dmcgonagle@princelobel.com](mailto:dmcgonagle@princelobel.com)

---

**From:** Carrie J. Parker [<mailto:cparker@keker.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 8:06 PM  
**To:** Gayle-Luz, Keisha <[kgayleluz@princelobel.com](mailto:kgayleluz@princelobel.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC - C.A.  
No. 1:19-cv-12551-FDS - Logistical issues for David  
Patterson Depo 3/10

Hi Keisha,  
I heard back from Google and yes, you can use WebEx  
(browser version) as the video platform for the  
deposition.

More information regarding the Google drive for depo  
exhibits:

The main concern Google has is making sure that the  
deposition exhibits can be loaded into a folder on  
Google drive. The way this would work is the Google  
paralegal, Suzie Gonzalez-Pender, will set up the  
deposition exhibit folder giving access to your attorneys  
that need it, our attorney defending the deposition, the  
witness, the court reporter and the videographer. She  
just needs to get the email addresses for the  
participants beforehand so she can verify that their  
email addresses are associated with a Google account. If  
their email address is not associated with a Google  
account, Suzie will send instructions on how to set it up.  
Once everyone is set up, Suzie will share the folder with  
everyone that needs access. Please forward all of the  
relevant email addresses to me and I will forward them  
on to Suzie and we can go from there for the Google  
drive folder set-up.

Thanks,  
Carrie

---

**From:** Gayle-Luz, Keisha  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 1:35 PM  
**To:** Carrie J. Parker

**Subject:** RE: Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC - C.A.  
No. 1:19-cv-12551-FDS - Logistical issues for David  
Patterson Depo 3/10

[EXTERNAL]

---

Hi Carrie,

Inquiring to see if Google has a policy restricting the use  
of Webex as a video platform for depositions.

Thanks,  
Keisha

---

**From:** Carrie J. Parker [<mailto:cparker@keker.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 2, 2021 5:44 PM  
**To:** Gayle-Luz, Keisha <[kgayleluz@princelobel.com](mailto:kgayleluz@princelobel.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC - C.A.  
No. 1:19-cv-12551-FDS - Logistical issues for David  
Patterson Depo 3/10

That sounds good, thank you!

---

**From:** Gayle-Luz, Keisha <[kgayleluz@princelobel.com](mailto:kgayleluz@princelobel.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 2, 2021 2:21 PM  
**To:** Carrie J. Parker <[CParker@keker.com](mailto:CParker@keker.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC - C.A.  
No. 1:19-cv-12551-FDS - Logistical issues for David  
Patterson Depo 3/10

[EXTERNAL]

---

Hi Carrie,

Hope you are also doing well, and thank you for  
bringing these issues to my attention. I'll discuss with  
the team and get back to you with any questions we  
may have.

Best,  
Keisha

---

**From:** Carrie J. Parker [<mailto:cparker@keker.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 2, 2021 2:02 PM  
**To:** Gayle-Luz, Keisha <[kgayleluz@princelobel.com](mailto:kgayleluz@princelobel.com)>  
**Subject:** Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC - C.A. No.  
1:19-cv-12551-FDS - Logistical issues for David  
Patterson Depo 3/10

Hi Keisha,



I hope that you are doing well. Since you may be the person setting up the court reporter for the Patterson deposition going forward on March 10, I am reaching out to you to let you know about some logistical issues that have come up with Google witness depositions. These issues will affect all of the Google witness depositions in this case so my attorneys have asked that I reach out to let you and your office know about them as soon as possible so there can be protocols put in place.

1. Because of security concerns, Google has a policy that prohibits employees from having ZOOM installed on their Google computers. Therefore, the Patterson deposition cannot go forward using ZOOM. Google will allow as a first option Google meet and as a second option Skype. We can set up the Google meet for everyone including all parties and the court reporting service. I would need to know all participants that would need the Google meet link.
2. Because of security concerns, Google does not allow the use of court reporting services "exhibit share" sites that are used to load exhibits for the depositions. Google will allow a Google drive folder to be set up where all parties and the witness have access to the folder and the exhibits can be loaded or dropped in during the deposition. Typically, we (KVP) or Google would set up an empty Google drive folder and send around the link to that folder to be used for uploading the exhibits in real-time. The link would be sent around in advance of the deposition.

Once you have had a chance to speak with your attorneys, please let me know if they/you have any questions regarding the logistics for the Patterson deposition. I am happy to assist with coordination of the deposition logistics on my end.

Thank you,  
Carrie

---

**Carrie J. Parker**  
Senior Trial Paralegal  
Keker, Van Nest & Peters LLP  
633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809

415 773 6638 direct | 415 391 5400 main  
[cparker@keker.com](mailto:cparker@keker.com) | [keker.com](http://keker.com)

---

This email is intended for the confidential use of the addressees only. Because the information is subject to the attorney-client privilege and may be attorney work product, you should not file copies of this email with publicly accessible records. If you are not an addressee on this email or an addressee's authorized agent, you have received this email in error; please notify us immediately at 617 456 8000 and do not further review, disseminate or copy this email. Thank you.

-----

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: Any federal tax advice or information included in this message or any attachment is not intended to be, and may not be, used to avoid tax penalties or to promote, market, or recommend any transaction, matter, entity, or investment plan discussed herein. Prince Lobel Tye LLP does not otherwise by this disclaimer limit you from disclosing the tax structure of any transaction addressed herein.